🖎 AO 120 (Rev. 2/99)

Mail Stop 8 TO:

REPORT ON THE

P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450			FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK	
In Comp	oliance with 35 § 290 and	d/or 15 U.S.C. § 111	6 you are hereby advised that a court ac	tion has been
filed in the U.S. I	District Court Norther	<u>rn District Califo</u>	ornia on the Pater	
DOCKET NO.			J.S. DISTRICT COURT	
CV 12-02582 CW PLAINTIFF	5/18/12	450	Golden Gate Avenue, 16th Floor.	San Francisco CA 94102
UBIQUITI NETWORKS INC			DEFENDANT KOZUMI USA CORP., ET	
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATE OR TRADEMA		HOLDER OF PATENT OR	TRADEMARK
13,837,240	3,715,098	8	****see-attach-complaint***	
2 3,746,223	4,068,20	33	, in the second	
33,856,0/6				
4 2,888,037				
5 3,829, 292				·
In the about	INCLUDED BY	he following pat Amendment	ent(s) have been included:	
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATE	NT		Other Pleading
1	OR TRADEMAR	RK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR T	RADEMARK
2		·		
3				
4				
5				
In the above	entitled case, the follo	wing decision has b	een rendered or judgement issued:	
CLERK		(BY) DEPUTY CL	ERK	DATE
Richard W. Wieking			Gina Agustine-Rivas	May 21, 2012

∧O 120 (Rev. 2/99)

Mail Stop 8 TO:

Director of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPORT ON THE FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK

In Compliance with 35 § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been ☐ Trademarks: filed in the U.S. District Court Northern District of California on the following X Patents or U.S. DISTRICT COURT DATE FILED DOCKET NO. Office of the Clerk, 450 Golden Gate Ave., 16th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102 May 21, 2012 C-12-2623-EDL DEFENDANT PLAINTIFF INGENIADOR, LLC INFORMATICA CORPORATION DATE OF PATENT HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK PATENT OR OR TRADEMARK TRADEMARK NO. "Pls. See Attached Copy of Complaint" 2 3 4 5 In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included: INCLUDED BY DATE INCLUDED ☐ Other Pleading ☐ Cross Bill ☐ Answer ☐ Amendment HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK DATE OF PATENT PATENT OR OR TRADEMARK TRADEMARK NO. 2 3 4 5 In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT DATE (BY) DEPUTY CLERK CLERK 5/21/12 Thelma Nudo Richard W. Wieking

Copy 1—Upon initiation of action, mail this copy to Commissioner Copy 3—Upon termination of action, mail this copy to Commissioner Copy 2—Upon filing document adding patent(s), mail this copy to Commissioner Copy 4—Case file copy

ED

3. Defendant Ingeniador, LLC ("Ingeniador") is a Puerto Rico limited liability company with its principal place of business located in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. This action arises under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 et seq., and under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35, United States Code. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 et seq., and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338 and 2201-2202.
- 5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Ingeniador. Informatica is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Ingeniador has systematic and substantial contacts within the State of California, has conducted business in and directed to California, including business concerning the '629 patent, and has engaged in various acts in and directed to California, including asserting the '629 patent against companies located in California. Informatica is further informed and believed and thereon alleges that Ingeniador has pursued, negotiated and entered into agreements concerning the '629 patent with companies located in the Northern District of California, including Hewlett-Packard Company ("HP"), Oracle Corporation ("Oracle") and Interwoven, Inc. ("Interwoven").
- 6. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c) and § 1400(b) because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims at issue occurred in this District.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGMENT

7. This case is an Intellectual Property Action under Civil Local Rule 3-2(c) and, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-5(b), shall be assigned on a district-wide basis.

CASE AND CONTROVERSY

- 8. The '629 patent issued on January 24, 2006 to named inventors Steven Heaney, Nicolas James Williams, and Eric Brown and is entitled "Publishing System for Intranet."
 - 9. Ingeniador contends that it is the present owner of the '629 patent.

Ingeniador's Patent Infringement Suit Against Informatica

10. On August 26, 2011, Ingeniador filed a Complaint in the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico against sixteen companies, including Informatica, *Ingeniador v. Alfresco Software et al.*, Civil Action No. 3:11-cv-01840-GAG. The Complaint alleged, inter alia, infringement of the '629 patent by Informatica, including by Informatica's PowerCenter product.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 11. On November 3, 2011, Informatica and seven of the defendants filed a joint motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).
- On May 14, 2012, Judge Gustavo Gelpi of the District of Puerto Rico issued an Order, granting defendants' motion to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) and dismissed all remaining defendants, including Informatica, from the case. On May 15, 2012, the Court entered Judgment dismissing all claims against all remaining defendants, including Informatica. On information and belief, Ingeniador contests that the Court's dismissal and subsequent Judgment was a final adjudication on the merits.

Ingeniador's Business Activities With Companies In The Northern District of California

- On information and belief, several of the companies named as defendants in the 13. Ingeniador v. Alfresco Software, et al. action are either headquartered in or have substantial presence in the Northern District of California, including Informatica, HP, Oracle, and Interwoven.
- 14. On April 11, 2012, Ingeniador and Oracle filed a joint motion to dismiss Oracle with prejudice. The Court granted the motion to dismiss that same day.
- On May 9, 2012, Ingeniador and HP filed a joint motion to dismiss HP with 15. prejudice. That same day, Ingeniador and Interwoven filed a joint motion to dismiss Interwoven with prejudice. On May 10, 2012, the Court granted both motions.
- 16. On information and belief, Ingeniador has engaged in business activities, including active correspondence and exchange of business documents, with each of HP, Oracle and Interwoven, with the express intent of obtaining monetary consideration in return for a patent license and/or covenant not to sue as well as settlement of the lawsuit.
- On information and belief, Ingeniador has received or is contracted to receive 17. consideration from one of more of HP, Oracle and Interwoven, thereby benefiting from California companies in the form of monies and/or other business consideration.

COUNT ONE

(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '629 Patent)

18. Informatica incorporates and realleges each of the averments of paragraphs 1-17.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 19. In Ingeniador v. Alfresco Software et al., Ingeniador asserted that Informatica infringes the '629 patent, including through its PowerCenter product.
- 20. Informatica contends that it does not infringe, either directly or indirectly, any valid claim of the '629 patent.
- 21. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between Informatica and Ingeniador as to whether the '629 patent is infringed by Informatica, including its PowerCenter product.
- 22. Informatica seeks a declaratory judgment under Rule 57 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 2201 that Informatica, including its PowerCenter product, is not infringing and has not infringed, directly or indirectly, the '629 patent and granting Informatica all other declaratory relief to which it may be entitled.

COUNT TWO

(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '629 Patent)

- 23. Informatica incorporates and realleges each of the averments of paragraphs 1-21
- Informatica contends that the '629 patent is invalid for failure to comply with one or 24. more of the requirements for patentability of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and 112.
- 25. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between Informatica and Ingeniador as to whether the '629 patent is valid.
- Informatica seeks a declaratory judgment under Rule 57 of the Federal Rules of Civil 26. Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 2201 that the claims of the '629 patent are invalid and granting Informatica all other declaratory relief to which it may be entitled.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Informatica prays for the following relief:

- A declaration that Informatica, including its PowerCenter product, has not infringed and is not infringing, directly or indirectly, any claim of the '629 patent;
 - В. A declaration that the '629 patent is invalid;
- C. Preliminarily and permanently enjoining Ingeniador, its officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with it who receive actual notice by personal service or otherwise, from asserting or threatening to assert against customers, potential customers or users of Informatica's products, including its PowerCenter product any charge of infringement of the '629 patent;
- Preliminarily and permanently enjoining Ingeniador, its officers, agents, servants, D. employees, and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with it who receive actual notice by personal service or otherwise, from filing or prosecuting any civil action or actions against Informatica's products, including its PowerCenter product or its customers, or users of the Informatica products, for alleged infringement of the '629 patent;
 - Awarding to Informatica its costs and attorneys' fees; and E.
- Granting to Informatica such further necessary or proper relief as the Court may deem F. just.

DATED: May 24, 2012.

REED SMITH LLP

By_

Scott D. Baker (SBN 84923) John P. Bovich (SBN 150688)

Jonah D. Mitchell (SBN 203511)

Attorneys for Plaintiff, Informatica Corporation

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Informatica demands trial by jury on all such triable issues in this action.

DATED: May <u>U</u>, 2012.

REED SMITH LLP

Ву.

Scott D. Baker (SBN 84923)
John P. Boyich (SBN 150688)
Jonah D. Mitchell (SBN 203511)
Attorneys for Plaintiff, Informatica Corporation

A limited liability partnership formed in the State of Delaware